## REMARKS

Claims 2, 4 and 11-15 are pending in this application, of which claim 11 has been amended. Claims 1, 3 and 5-10 are canceled. No new claims have been added.

Claims 2, 4 and 11-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over **Semple et al.** (previously applied).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As noted in Applicant's response of October 21, 2005, **Semple et al.** discloses a system for providing Internet access through an ATM. A local processor interfaces with the machine's internal processor to facilitate communication to the World Wide Web. A communication subsystem, e.g., a modem or data communication card, provides for direct coupling to the Internet. Internal memory stores web browsing software and users can initiate web access through commands through a user interface, e.g., a keyboard. The system further provides for controlling web access at the banking institution which owns the machine. Individuals withdrawing money, therefore, can be charged for Internet access time automatically.

The Examiner has admitted that **Semple et al.** does not mention the words "state tables", but has urged that:

> Semple et al. provides a normal user interface to both ATM transactions and the access to the Internet (see column 4, lines 47-50). Moreover, a normal transaction-use state table is defined in the applicant's invention as a plurality of states on normal ATM transactions described in the figures 9-14 (state tables A through J), is well known in the conventional ATM. Because Semple et al. provides a normal user interface to ATM transactions, it is inherent that the system of Semple et al. must store a normal transaction-use processing state table such as a plurality of states on normal ATM transactions described in the figures

-7-

9-14 in the applicant's invention, in order to provide a normal user interface to ATM transactions. The same for WEB transaction-use processing state tables, because Semple et al. provides access to the Internet, it is inherent that the system of Semple et al. must store a plurality of html pages (or WEB transaction-use processing state tables) in order to provide access to the Internet. Therefore, Semple et al. inherently teaches both a normal transaction-use processing state table and a WEB transaction-use processing state table. (Sic.)

As noted in Applicant's response of October 21, 2005, **Semple et al.** fails to teach, mention or suggest both a normal transaction-use processing state table and a WEB transaction-use processing state table, as recited in claims 11 and 12. **Semple et al.** further fails to teach, mention or suggest a state table acquiring section which acquires a state table from a source of the state table through communication line and sets, supplements, or updates the state table of the state table group, as recited in claim 11 of the instant application.

In particular, the Examiner asserts that a state table acquiring section is disclosed in column 3, lines 9-15 of **Semple et al.** However, **Semple et al.** only discloses <u>display of a web page</u> on the display of the ATM, and neither teaches nor suggests <u>setting, supplementing, or updating a state table included in the state table group (e.g., the WEB transaction-use state table)</u> based on the received state table, as recited in amended claim 11. Support for this limitation can be found at page 13, lines 14-19 and page 19, lines 12-16 of the specification of the instant application.

The Examiner also asserts that a state table group including a normal transaction-use state table and a WEB transaction-use state table is well known in the art, although he acknowledges that **Semple et al.** does not disclose such a state table group (page 8, lines 7-13). However,

neither the normal transaction-use state table nor the WEB transaction-use state table according to amended claim 11 <u>stores a plurality of html pages</u> (page 8, lines 18-20), but <u>defines a state in which the automatic transaction device gets into during normal or WEB transactions</u>. Support for this limitation can be found at page 14, lines 2-6 and 18-24 of the specification of the instant application. If the html pages acquired by the automatic transaction device in WEB transactions can be regarded as "a plurality of states on WEB transaction," they are clearly different from <u>the states or operations of the automatic transaction device itself</u> that performs WEB transactions.

Thus, the processing state tables claimed in the instant application are not the equivalent of the "interfaces" in **Semple et al.**, and the manipulation of such tables by the separate normal transaction control unit and the WEB transaction control unit provides advantages over the prior art (including **Semple et al.**) as disclosed from page 23, line 15 to page 36, line 19 of the specification of the instant application. In particular, the present invention makes it possible to execute not only normal transactions, but also the WEB transactions which deal with new trading while updating information on demand, without causing any adverse effect on the control of the normal transactions.

Moreover, **Semple et al.** clearly fails to teach, mention or suggest the elements of a WEB transaction-use table as specifically recited in claim 13; the specific elements of an extension file as recited in claim 14; and the specific elements of an extension state table, as recited in claim 15 of the instant application.

The undersigned conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner on May 30, 2006 to discuss the patentability of the rejected claims.

In the interview, the undersigned proposed adding the limitations of claim 13 or claim 15 to claim 11. Although it was noted that **Flenley** was cited only for teaching "a specification of a screen displayed upon access to a WEB server; a specification of an extension file in which one portion of the definition for the WEB transaction is written," the Examiner urges that "the rest of the features are well-known in the art of accessing the Internet."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, it does not appear to be well-known to have a WEB transaction-use state table which has at least the following specifications, as recited in claim 13:

> a specification of the next state table upon normal completion of the WEB transaction;
> a specification of a next state table upon completion of the WEB transaction with a predetermined code;

It also does not appear to be well-known that the extension state table includes a "specification of a next state table upon completion of the WEB transaction with a predetermined code," as recited in claim 15.

These arguments were presented to the Examiner and she still maintained her rejections.

**Flenley** does not teach, mention or suggest any of the specifications recited in claims 13 and 15.

Accordingly, the limitations of claims 13 and 15 have been added to claim 11.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 2, 4 and 11-15, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

William L. Brooks
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/ak
Atty. Docket No. **010118**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930

23850
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures:    Petition for Extension of Time
               Check in the amount of $450.00

Q:\HOME\AKERR\WLB\01\010118\amendment af june 2006

-11-